

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1-12 are pending in the Application. Claims 8-12 were withdrawn earlier. A Request for Continued Examination accompanies this paper. Reconsideration and re-examination are respectfully requested.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite “at least one flow passage radially opening into an annular passage of the annular passage arrangement for introducing material forming the viewing strip, the flow passage opening upstream of the annular gap in the region of separation of the flow paths, said flow passage being provided by a flow divider, the flow divider including a flow passage bore which extends transversely with respect to the extrusion direction and which establishes flow passage communication with said annular passage.” Support may be found in original claim 3 as well as at page 8, lines 7-11 of the specification which recite “[r]eference numeral **8** in Figure 1 denotes a flow passage bore which opens into the annular passage **3b** downstream of the location at which the passages **3b** and **3c** come together. The passage bore **8** extends transversely with respect to the extrusion direction through the extrusion head **1**.” Also, see page 8, lines 24-25 which recites “[r]eferring now to Figure 2, there is a flow divider **11** through which the flow passage bore **8** extends.” Accordingly, no new matter has been entered.

Claim 3 has been amended to recite an extrusion head as set forth in claim 1, wherein said flow divider includes an extension portion and an opening for said flow passage bore, including a roof disposed above said opening.” Support may be found at page 8, lines 25-27 which recites “[t]he flow divider **11** has an extension portion **12** of a generally roof-shaped configuration in cross-section transversely with respect to said flow passage bore.” In addition, support may be found at page 8, line 33 to page 9, line 4. which recites “[t]he extension portion

12 with its generally roof-shaped configuration thus provides an apex which is disposed about the mouth opening of the flow passage bore **8** and which faces upwardly in **FIG. 1**, that is to say in opposite relationship to the flow of softened thermoplastic material through the flow passage **3b**. Accordingly, no new matter has been entered.

Claims 1, 3-5 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ohta (USP 5,460,772). To the extent that Ohta may be viewed as applicable to the amended claims herein, it is noted as follows.

Ohta appears to be directed at a blow molding process for forming a multilayer tubular preform of a plurality of thermoplastic materials with at least one strip of material extending in the extrusion direction. The extrusion head disclosed includes a plurality of annular passages in mutually concentric relationship which form mutually separate flow paths for materials forming the various layers of the multilayer preform. Ohta, however, does not teach or suggest a flow passage radially opening into the annular passage of the annular passage arrangement, the flow passage provided by a flow divider, the flow divider including a flow passage bore which extends transversely with respect to the extrusion direction, the flow passage bore thereby establishing the flow passage communication with the annular passage. See, amended claim 1. Ohta discloses a lotus root **2** having circular arcs **2a** and bridges **2b**, **2c** wherein the bridges divide the flow (see **FIG. 2** of Ohta).

Claims 2 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohta (USP 5,460,772) in view of Richter (USP 6,764,639) and applicant's admission (page 10, lines 21-22). Ohta is discussed above. To the extent that Richter is viewed as applicable to the amended claims herein, Applicants note as follows.

Richter discloses an annular piston **5** and a flow channel bore **17**. However, the flow channel bore does not itself include a flow divider, that is, a separate component, but is instead simply a passageway drilled in the annular piston **5**. Richter relies upon a torpedo **18**, however, the torpedo does not contain a flow passage bore therethrough. Accordingly, it is not believed that Ohta in combination with Richter teaches or suggests the features of amended claim 1. Dependent claims 2-7 depend directly from amended claim 1 and are believed to be similarly distinguished.

In sum, it is respectfully submitted that in view of the amendments herein and remarks above, the claims satisfy the requirements of patentability under 35 USC § 102 and/or 103 in view of the references of record. Allowance at an early date is respectfully solicited.

In the event the Examiner deems personal contact is necessary, please contact the undersigned attorney at (603) 668-6560.

In the event there are any fee deficiencies or additional fees are payable, please charge them (or credit any overpayment) to our Deposit Account No. 50-2121.

Respectfully submitted,

/Steven J. Grossman/

Steven J. Grossman
Reg. No.: 35,001
Customer No. 32047
Grossman, Tucker, Perreault & Pflieger
55 South Commercial Street
Manchester, NH 03101
Tel.: (603) 668-6560